

27th December 1956]

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clauses 2 and 1 were separately put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) (Second Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 38 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be passed.”

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

“ That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) (Second Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 38 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

(5) THE MADRAS GENERAL SALES TAX (FOURTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956 (L.A. BILL NO. 39 OF 1956).

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras General Sales Tax (Fourth Amendment) Bill a 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration.”

At present the sale of bullion and specie is liable to tax, at a single point only, at the rate of one-fourth of one per cent of the turnover. In Mysore there is already a single point levy at one-half of one per cent. The Andhra Government have recently amended their Act so as to increase the rate of single point levy from one-fourth of one per cent to one-half of one per cent. In order to fall in line with the neighbouring States and also with a view to increasing the revenue of this State, this Bill has been brought forward with this amendment, viz., to increase the rate on bullion and specie from one-fourth of one per cent to one-half of one per cent of turnover.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved—

“ That the Madras General Sales Tax (Fourth Amendment) Bill a, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration.”

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : This amendment has had a curious history. Originally they included bullion in the General Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill. But when the Bill was considered by the Select Committee, there was a lot of discussion whether tax on bullion should be increased or not; finally they dropped it. Now, they have again revised it. No mention is made in the speech of the Hon. Minister why it should be

[Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar] [27th December 1956]

revived. He gave two apparent reasons; one is to increase the revenue which is quite obvious and the other is that they want to fall in line with the neighbouring States of Mysore and Andhra. I wish they fell in line with the neighbouring States in all matters. (Sri A. M. Allapichai: At least in good matters let them fall in line with the neighbouring States.) This is not a good matter. That is what I am saying. The point to be noted here is this. The Andhra and Mysore Governments do not levy as much licence fee as our Government do. The maximum of licence fee leviable in Madras State is Rs. 2,000. But in Andhra and Mysore States the maximum ranges from Rs. 100 to Rs. 200. I speak on the authority of the memorandum that was submitted to the Hon. the Minister for Revenue by the Bullion and Silver Merchants' Association, Coimbatore, on 22nd December 1956. I take that as the authority for my statement. I do not know the actual state of affairs. Since it is said that this Government want to fall in line with the Andhra and the Mysore States, they can fall in line with them by reducing the maximum licence fee at present leviable in our State to the level obtaining in Andhra and Mysore States. But to keep the maximum at the same high level and to increase the levy of sales tax to one-half of one per cent of the turnover is rather unfair.

4-30 p.m. Therefore, these merchants made a special appeal and a memorandum was submitted by them to the Hon. the Revenue Minister. It is a விண்ணப்பம். In that *vinnappam* they have said—

“கனம் ரெவின்யூ அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கூறியுள்ளதுபோல் அண்டைய ராஜ்யங்களில் உள்ள நடைமுறையை அனுசரித்து நமது ராஜ்ய வரி விதிப்பையும் மாற்ற உத்தேசித்திருப்பதை வரவேற்கிறோம். ஆனால் சாதகமாக இருப்பதை மாத்திரம் அதிகப்படுத்திக்கொண்டு, பாதகமாக இருப்பதை அப்படியே வைத்துக்கொள்வது ஜனநாயக ரீதியில் சிறிதும் நியாயமாகாது. (I agree) ஆதலால் மசோதாவை பரிசீலிக்கும்போது புல்லியன் லைசென்ஸ் கட்டணம், விலையுயர்ந்த கற்கள் மீது அதிக வரி முதலியவைகளையும் அண்டை ராஜ்யங்களை அனுசரித்து திருத்தும்படி வேண்டிக்கொள்ளுகிறோம்.”

They want amendment in that way. That cannot be done until after the Elections! And what is contained in this Bill only will obtain. Therefore, I feel, Sir, that this Bill is not at all necessary, that is, this increase of tax from $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on bullion, especially when the Government have dropped the proposal earlier. What has happened in the last few months, in this short period? The one argument is that the other States have done it. Have the Government done the other things the other States have done? Have they followed the other States in the matter of land reforms? That has been my fundamental complaint. If they want to follow them in this matter, they should follow them in other matters as well. Why should they try to fall in line with the other States in the matter of sales tax only? What special grounds they have for this I do not know. If they want to do this in line with the other States, let them reduce the licence fee also. Let them do it one way or the other, but let them not have it both ways.

27th December 1956]

*SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI: கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, பொது விற்பனை வரி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் பொதுவாக சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். பொது விற்பனை வரியை ஒரு முனையில் விதிக்க வேண்டும் என்று ஆரம்பத்திலிருந்தே வியாபாரிகள் ஆண்டுதொறும் விபரமல் சர்க்காரிடம் சொல்லிவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அவர்களுடைய கோரிக்கை கவனிக்கப்படாமல் புறக்கணிக்கப்பட்டே வந்திருக்கிறது. வியாபாரிகள் தங்களுடைய நலத்திற்காகத்தான் இந்த வரியைப் பல முனையிலிருந்து ஒரு முனையாக மாற்றவேண்டும் என்று சொல்கிறார்கள் என்று தப்பான அபிப்பிராயத்தைப் பொது மக்களிடத்தில் அரசியலார் பரப்பிவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்தத் தப்பு அபிப்பிராயத்தை மாற்றுவதற்கு வியாபாரிகள் இதுகாறும் முயற்சி செய்தவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். வியாபாரிகள் கடந்த நான்கு ஆண்டுகளாக பொதுக் கூட்டங்களும் மகாநாடுகளும் கூட்டியும், சம்பந்தப்பட்ட அமைச்சர் அவர்களுக்கு விண்ணப்பங்கள் அனுப்பியும், அவர்களை துதுகோஷ்டி சென்று பார்த்தும், தங்கள் கோரிக்கை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்காகப் பாடுபட்டார்கள். வியாபாரிகள் அமைச்சர்களால் கூட்டுவிக்கப்பட்ட கூட்டங்களில் கலந்து கொண்டார்கள். இவர்கள் சர்க்காருக்கு விற்பனை வரி கொடுக்க எந்தக் காலத்திலும் மறுத்ததுமில்லை, தயங்கியதுமில்லை. அரசாங்கத்தாருக்கு இந்த இனத்தில் எவ்வளவு வருமானம் வருகிறதோ அதற்குக் கொள்சம் கூடக் குறையாமல் இனிமேலும் வருவதற்கு ஏற்றவாறு அரசாங்கத்தோடு ஒத்துழைக்கத் தயாராக இருக்கிறோம் என்று வியாபாரிகளாகிய நாங்கள் சொல்லி வந்திருக்கிறோம். ஆனால் அரசாங்கத்தார் இந்த விஷயத்தில் ஒரு திட்டமான முடிவுக்கு உடனடியாக வராமல், 'ஏதாவது ஒரு சரக்கின்மீது பரிட்சார்த்தமாக ஒரு முனை வரி விதிக்கிறோம்' என்று சொல்லி வந்திருக்கிறார்கள்; அழுகிப் போகக்கூடிய சரக்குகளுக்கு விற்பனை வரியினின்று விலக்களிக்க வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டால், ஒரு ஆண்டில், ஏதாவது ஒரு சமயத்தில், ஒன்றிரண்டு சரக்குகளுக்கு விலக்குக் கொடுத்து விட்டதாகச் சொல்லிவிட்டு, மற்றப் பொருள்களை ஆண்டு இறுதியில் கவனிப்பதாகச் சொல்கிறார்கள்; சர்க்கார் ஏதாவது ஒரு திட்டமான முடிவுக்கு இதுகாறும் வரவில்லை. இன்று திரு. புருஷோத்தம் அவர்கள் சொல்லியதுபோல், பால், தேங்காய் சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில், நாங்கள் அடிக்கடி எவ்வளவோ கோரியிருந்தும் அரசாங்கத்தார் விலக்குக் கொடுக்காமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். எனக்குத் தெரியும்: கனம் வருமான வரி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் உள்ளத்தில் பாலுக்குக் கூடாயம் விலக்குக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணம் இருக்கிறது; அதையொட்டி தேங்காய்க்கும் விலக்களிக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் அவர்கள் விரும்புகிறார்கள்; ஆனால் மற்றத் துறைகளில் (இலாகாக்களில்) உள்ளவர்களின் முட்டுக்கையால்தான் அவர்கள் விலக்களிக்க முடியாமலிருக்கிறார்கள். இருந்தபோதிலும், வியாபாரிகள் திருப்பத் திருப்ப ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வர் விதிக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னதற்கிணங்க 8 சரக்குகள் மீது எப்ரல் மாதம் 1-ம் தேதி முதல் ஒரு முனை வரி விதிக்கப்போவதாக அரசியலார் சொன்னார்கள். அது சம்பந்தமாக மசோதா செஜ்ட்டில் பிரசுரிக்கப்பட்ட பின் அங்கத்தினர் களுக்குப் பிரதிகள் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அதைக் காலாகாலத்தில் கீழ் சபையில் கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்றி பிறகு இங்கே கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்றவேண்டும். அதையாவது செய்தால், வியாபாரிகள் திருப்தியோடு மேலும் மேலும் வரி கொடுப்பதற்குத் தோதாக இருக்கும் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்கிறேன். அந்த மசோதா இந்தக் கூட்டத்தில் சபைக்கு வராதா என்று தெரிகிறது. தேர்தல் முடிந்தவுடன் மார்ச் மாத இறுதியிலாவது சர்க்கார் அந்த மசோதாவைச் சட்டமாக்கி அமலுக்குக் கொண்டுவருவார்கள் என்ற நன்நம்பிக்கையோடு நாங்கள் இருக்கிறோம். அந்த நம்பிக்கையில் நாங்கள் உறுதியாக இருக்கிறோம். ஆயினும் எல்லாச் சரக்குகளுக்கும் ஒரு முனையில் விற்பனை வரி விதிக்கவேண்டும் என்று நாங்கள் இதுகாறும் தெரிவித்தவந்த கோரிக்கையில் இன்னும் உறுதியாக இருக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்கிறேன். அந்த கோரிக்கையை ஒப்புக்கொண்டு அதை நிறைவேற்றும் வரையிலும் வியாபாரிகள் திருப்தியடைய மாட்டார்கள்; அது நிறைவேறும்படி செய்வதற்கான முயற்சியை எடுத்துக்

[Sri V. V. Ramaswami]

[27th December 1956]

கொண்டுதான் இருப்பார்கள். இந்த மசோதாவில் செய்துள்ளதபோல் மற்ற ராஜ்யங்களில் விற்பனை வரிச் சட்டத்தில் செய்யும் சில மாறுதல்களை நம் ராஜ்யத்திலும் செய்வதானது நம் ராஜ்யத்திற்குத் தகுந்ததாக இல்லை; இது நமது ராஜ்ய வியாபாரிகளின் நம்பிக்கையைக் குறைக்கிறதே தவிர, அவர்களுக்கு நம்பிக்கை யூட்டுவதாக இல்லை என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டு என்னுடைய வார்த்தையை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: Mr. Chairman, I had no idea of intervening in this debate. But when I heard the hon. Member Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar and the representations of the Tamil Nadu Thangam, Velli, Vairam, Nakai Vyaparikal Sammelanam, I was tempted to represent to the Government one or two things. While the Sammelanam welcomes the move on the part of the Government to bring in a legislation on this question, falling in line with the Andhra and the Mysore Governments, the other point raised by them should also receive the earnest consideration of the Government. I am sure the Hon. Minister will not lay aside the objections raised by them with regard to the levy of licence fees at a very high rate here, compared with the licence fees levied in those States to fall in line with whom we are seeking now to revise the rate of sales tax in this Bill. This aspect of the matter, I am sure, will receive the consideration of the Government.

The other point I wish to refer to is what the Hon. the Finance Minister has just now told us, with regard to the exemption from sales tax of coconut and milk. In that regard, the Hon. the Finance Minister said that because the Government had not come forward with proposals for additional taxation, it would not be possible for them to consider the question of exemption. What we have passed is only an interim Budget. Well, Sir, the very Bill now before us says that it is proposed to amend the Act with a view to increasing the revenues of the State also. When we are increasing the revenues of the State by this measure, the other question also should be considered, once the general principle has been accepted that essential or perishable articles of food should be exempted from levy of sales tax. Sir, here is a legislation before us by which we are going to increase the revenues of the State. I, therefore, once again plead with the Government that these two items of food articles, viz., coconut and milk, also may be exempted from the levy of sales tax and the sooner the Hon. Minister does it, the better it would be and we would all welcome it. We have been pressing for it and the objection raised by the Hon. the Finance Minister is literally removed by this very measure that is before us. I request the Hon. Minister to consider this aspect and see that exemption is given for these articles of food.

4-40
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: Sir, this is the last session before the general elections to the Assembly. Perhaps, for that reason, we did not want to restrict the scope of the discussion strictly to the provisions of the Bill. I say this because the hon. Member from Virudunagar dealt with the general question of single-point levy and multi-point levy. Now, the Bill deals only

27th December 1956] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu]

with single-point tax. But the hon. Member availed himself of this occasion to air his views about single-point levy and multi-point levy. He also began to talk about the exemption of perishable articles from sales tax. First of all, let me answer the points arising out of this Bill and then, with your permission, Sir, I shall make a reference also to the other point.

No doubt, this Bill was sought to be passed some months back, but it was dropped. It was dropped with the best of intentions. In the neighbouring States the rate was lower than what we proposed here. Therefore, it would have been a serious handicap to the merchants here. That was why we did not want to push through the Bill then. But now, the other States, namely, Mysore and Andhra States, have adopted such a measure. Therefore, I think there is no reason why we should not adopt it. If we do not adopt it, it will be a source of embarrassment to the merchants living in one area or the other.

Now, the hon. Member Sri K. Balasubramania Ayyar said "You now quote the example of other States because it is to your advantage. Why not you adopt the same thing in respect of other legislations also, for example, the land reform legislation?" Well, Sir, he is a lawyer and I am also a lawyer. We always quote decisions favourable to us. We do not refer to unfavourable decisions.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: As a matter of etiquette, we should refer to unfavourable decisions also.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: I shall try to follow that etiquette. Now, Bombay and Hyderabad have also adopted some legislation with regard to land reform. If the hon. Member wants me to follow those States in that respect, I will have no objection. The hon. Member will regret if I really translate that into action because in Hyderabad and Bombay they have fixed one-sixth of the produce as rent for the landlord and the tillers have actually become pattadars. The tillers have to pay compensation in instalments spread over twenty years. Therefore, we cannot strictly enforce that rule of following in the footsteps of other States. But in this instance, we thought that it was reasonable to follow the example of other States. That was why I mentioned it.

The hon. Member said that the rate of licence fee was very high in our State. It is not so. Probably, the hon. Member was frightened by the schedule given in the Bill. The licence fee prevailing here is this. The licence fee in respect of bullion and other such species is Rs. 100 for a turnover not exceeding Rs. 20,000 per annum and another Rs. 200 for a turnover exceeding Rs. 20,000 per annum but not exceeding Rs. 1 lakh. Therefore, for a turnover up to Rs. 1 lakh, the fee will be only Rs. 300. For a turnover exceeding Rs. 1 lakh, it would be another Rs. 100

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu] [27th December 1956]

for a lakh of rupees. When the turnover increases, the fee may go up. But we should not be frightened about that. If the turnover is greater, naturally the fee also increases.

With regard to exemption from sales tax, I do not know how the hon. Member Sri V. V. Ramaswami was able to read my mind. He seems to have said that I have something in my mind, which I am not able to give effect to. I do not know if my mind is so transparent. If it is transparent, I should conceal it so that others may not read my mind. As regards exemption, we have given exemption in the case of almost all perishable articles. The only remaining articles that come under this category of perishable articles are coconut (fresh coconut) and milk. I said in the Lower House to-day that the matter was under consideration. I thought that only the lawyers were adepts in making use of situations for their own purposes. I do not know how the hon. Member Sri Purushotham turned to be such an adept to make use of the situation because he very cleverly pointed out, 'You are making some money under this Bill. Why not you, therefore, give some exemption in the case of certain articles?' Of course, that looks reasonable and it appeals to me also. But, as I said, the time is not very far off when a decision in this regard will be taken and then we will know what articles will get total exemption and what articles will come in for single-point levy. Therefore, it is a matter of time.

I shall also take this opportunity to refer to the very cordial atmosphere, complimentary atmosphere, that is prevailing here to-day. Laudatory speeches were made and I thank all hon. Members for that. I thank you also, Sir, for your kindness for though you have been silent and have not opened your mouth, I think you are also a party to the laudatory atmosphere that is prevailing here.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall certainly be a party to the laudatory atmosphere prevailing here and I shall reserve my speech at the time of adjournment; I hope the Hon. Minister will be here to bear that so that he may hear some very complimentary things spoken about him. The question is—

“ That the Madras General Sales Tax (Fourth Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clauses 2 and 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras General Sales Tax (Fourth Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly be passed.”

27th December 1956]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

“ That the Madras General Sales Tax (Fourth Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1956), as passed by the Legislative Assembly be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned.



[27th December 1956]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 3 asked by Sri G. Krishnamoorthi at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 27th December 1956, page 347 supra.]

List of municipalities and district boards adopting Government scales of pay for the teachers employed in elementary schools under their control.

Municipalities—

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| 1 Vellore. | 8 Salem. |
| 2 Villupuram. | 9 Tiruvallur. |
| 3 Kumbakonam. | 10 Melapalayam. |
| 4 Tiruchirappalli. | 11 Aruppu'kottai. |
| 5 Karur. | 12 Gobichettipalayam. |
| 6 Madurai. | 13 Madras Corporation— |
| 7 Coimbatore. | over and above the |
| | Government scales of |
| | pay. |

District boards—*Nil.*

List of district boards and municipalities which have adopted Government scales of pay for teachers in secondary schools under their control.

Municipalities—

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 Kancheepuram. | 15 Coimbatore. |
| 2 Vellore. | 16 Erode. |
| 3 Gudiyattam. | 17 Dharapuram. |
| 4 Tirupathur. | 18 Pollachi. |
| 5 Walajapet. | 19 Tiruppur. |
| 6 Cuddalore. | 20 Salem. |
| 7 Villupuram. | 21 Ootacamund. |
| 8 Kumbakonam. | 22 Coonoor. |
| 9 Mayuram. | 23 Karaikudi. |
| 10 Karur. | 24 Kodaikanal. |
| 11 Madurai. | 25 Aruppukkottai. |
| 12 Dindigul. | 26 Rasipuram. |
| 13 Virudunagar. | 27 Gobichettipalayam. |
| 14 Tirunelveli. | 28 Mettupalayam. |

District boards—

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 Chingleput. | } In the case of L.T. and B.T. Assistants
only. |
| 2 Tanjore. | |
| 3 North Arcot. | |
| 4 South Arcot. | |
| 5 Tiruchirappalli. | |
| 6 Tirunelveli. | |
| 7 Salem. | |
| 8 Coimbatore. | |

27th December 1956]

APPENDIX II.

[Vide item III (1) on page 348 supra.]

L.A. BILL No. 44 OF 1956.

(As passed by the Assembly)

A Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State for the service of a part of the financial year commencing on the 1st April 1957.

WHEREAS it is necessary, in pursuance of clause (1) of Article 206 of the Constitution, to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State for the service of a part of the financial year commencing on the 1st April 1957;

Enacted in the Seventh Year of the Republic of India as follows :—

1. *Short title*—This Act may be called the Madras Appropriation (Vote on Account) Act, 1956.

2. *Withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State for a part of the financial year commencing on the 1st April 1957.*—The State Government may withdraw from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State sums not exceeding fifty-eight crores, fifty-nine lakhs, thirty-two thousand and two hundred rupees to meet—

(a) the grants made in advance by the Madras Legislative Assembly for a part of the financial year commencing on the 1st April 1957, as set forth in column (3) of the schedule; and

(b) the expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State for the same part of the same financial year, as set forth in column (4) of the schedule.

3. *Appropriation.*—The sums authorized to be withdrawn from and out of the Consolidated Fund by this Act shall be appropriated for the services and purposes expressed in the schedule in relation to the said year.

THE SCHEDULE.

(See sections 2 and 3.)

Demand number.	Services and purposes.	Sums not exceeding		
		Voted by the Legislative Assembly.	Charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State.	Total.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		RS.	RS.	RS.
I	Land Revenue Department.	31,00,000	200	31,00,200
II	Excise Department ..	2,50,000	400	2,50,400

[27th December 1956]

Sums not exceeding

<i>Demand number.</i>	<i>Services and purposes.</i>	<i>Voted by the Legislative Assembly.</i>	<i>Charged on the Consoli- dated Fund of the State.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		RS.	RS.	RS.
III	Stamps Administration.	5,50,000	..	5,50,000
IV	Forest Department ..	19,00,000	400	19,00,400
V	Registration Department.	12,50,000	100	12,50,100
VI	Motor Vehicles Acts —Administration.	4,00,000	20,50,000	24,50,000
VII	General Sales Tax, Taxes and Duties —Administration.	43,00,000	10,000	43,10,000
VIII	Irrigation	52,00,000	..	52,00,000
	Debt Charges	..	2,00,00,000	2,00,00,000
IX	Head of State, Ministers and Headquarters Staff.	35,00,000	4,00,000	39,00,000
X	State Legislature ..	12,00,000	20,000	12,20,000
XI	District Administra- tion and Mis- cellaneous.	1,05,00,000	4,000	1,05,04,000
XII	Administration of Justice.	32,50,000	5,50,000	38,00,000
XIII	Jails	29,00,000	100	29,00,100
XIV	Police	1,90,00,000	100	1,90,00,100
XV	Education	3,60,00,000	..	3,60,00,000
XVI	Medical	1,21,00,000	200	1,21,00,200
XVII	Public Health ..	31,50,000	200	31,50,200
XVIII	Agriculture and Fisheries.	75,00,000	400	75,00,400
XIX	Veterinary	24,00,000	400	24,00,400
XX	Co-operation ..	27,00,000	400	27,00,400
XXI	Industries and Cinchona.	1,85,00,000	..	1,85,00,000
XXII	Harijan Uplift ..	40,00,000	400	40,00,400
XXIII	Labour including Factories.	6,50,000	500	6,50,500
XXIV	Civil Works—Works.	2,07,00,000	1,30,000	2,08,30,000
XXV	Civil Works—Establi- shment and Tools and Plant.	41,50,000	..	41,50,000
XXVI	Civil Works—Grants- in-aid.	10,00,000	..	10,00,000
XXVII	Electricity	6,00,00,000	..	6,00,00,000
XXVIII	Famine	1,50,000	..	1,50,000
XXIX	Pensions	50,00,000	1,00,000	51,00,000
XXX	Stationery and Printing.	30,00,000	2,60,000	32,60,000
XXXI	Miscellaneous ..	36,00,000	5,00,000	41,00,000
XXXII	Community Develop- ment Projects, etc.	92,00,000	400	92,00,400

27th December 1956]

Demand number.	Service and purposes.	Voted by the Legislative Assembly.	Sums not exceeding	
			Charged on the Consoli- dated Fund of the State.	Total.
(1)	(2)	(3) RS.	(4) RS.	(5) RS.
XXXIII	Road Transport Schemes.	57,00,000	..	57,00,000
XXXIV	Compensation to Zamindars.	20,00,000	..	20,00,000
XXXV	Capital Outlay on Forests.	5,50,000	..	5,50,000
XXXVI	Capital Outlay on Irrigation.	2,05,00,000	..	2,05,00,000
XXXVII	Capital Outlay on Public Health.	46,00,000	..	46,00,000
XXXVIII	Capital Outlay on Agriculture.	2,50,000	..	2,50,000
XXXIX	Capital Outlay on Industrial Development.	64,00,000	..	64,00,000
XL	Capital Outlay on Civil Works.	1,07,00,000	..	1,07,00,000
XL1	Capital Outlay on Electricity Schemes.	15,00,00,000	..	15,00,00,000
XLII	Capital Outlay on Road Transport Schemes.	37,50,000	..	37,50,000
XLIII	Commuted Value of Pensions	3,50,000	4,000	3,54,000
XLIV	Capital Outlay on Schemes of State Trading.	1,90,00,000	..	1,90,00,000
XLV	Loans and Advances by the State Government.	2,70,00,000	..	2,70,00,000
	Public Debt—Re-pay-ment.	..	6,00,00,000	6,00,00,000
Grand total ..		50,19,00,000	8,40,32,200	58,59,32,200

I certify that this is a Money Bill.

B. BHAKTHAVATSALU NAIDU,
Deputy Speaker, Madras Legislative Assembly.

[27th December 1956]

APPENDIX III.

[Vide item III (2) on page 365 supra.]

L.A. BILL No. 45 OF 1956.

(As passed by the Assembly.)

A Bill to provide for the appropriation of certain further moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of the State for the service of the financial year which commenced on the 1st April 1956.

WHEREAS it is necessary to provide for the appropriation of certain further moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of the State for the service of the financial year which commenced on the 1st April 1956 :

BE it enacted in the Seventh Year of the Republic of India as follows :—

1. *Short title.*—This Act may be called the Madras Appropriation (No. 6) Act, 1956.

2. *Supplementary Appropriation out of the Consolidated Fund for the financial year which commenced on the 1st April 1956.*—The State Government may appropriate out of the Consolidated Fund of the State, for the financial year which commenced on the 1st April 1956, a further sum not exceeding thirty-six crores, forty lakhs, thirty-eight thousand and six hundred rupees, being moneys required to meet—

(a) the supplementary grants made by the Madras Legislative Assembly for that period, as set forth in column (3) of the Schedule; and

(b) the supplementary expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State for that period, as set forth in column (4) of the Schedule.

THE SCHEDULE.

Demand number.	Services and purposes.	Sums not exceeding.		
		Voted by the Legislative Assembly.	Charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State.	Total.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		RS.	RS.	RS.
II	Excise Department.	27,400	..	27,400
VI	Motor Vehicles Acts—Administration.	22,700	..	22,700
VII	General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties—Administration.	13,29,000	..	13,29,000
VIII	Irrigation	52,00,000	..	52,00,000
	Debt Charges	..	80,60,000	80,60,000
IX	Head of State, Ministers and Headquarters Staff.	5,21,400	1,13,900	6,35,300